

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DONNA J. THOMAS, ADMINISTRATRIX OF)	
THE ESTATE OF ANDRE THOMAS,)	
DECEASED, ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE)	
OF ANDRE THOMAS,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	Civil Action No. 09-996
)	
V.)	Judge Nora Barry Fischer
)	
BOROUGH OF SWISSVALE, DEBRA)	
LYNN INDOVINA-AKERLY, JUSTIN)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
LEE KEENAN and GARY DICKSON,)	
)	
Defendants)	

DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS

OF

CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., J.D.

EXHIBIT 4

TO

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY OF
DEBORAH MASH, PH.D. AND ANY EVIDENCE REGARDING AN
ALLEGED CONDITION REFERRED TO AS EITHER EXCITED
DELIRIUM, AGITATED DELIRIUM AND/OR DRUG-INDUCED
DELIRIUM**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

- - - -

DONNA J. THOMAS, Administratrix)
of the Estate of Andre Thomas,)
Deceased, on behalf of the)
Estate of Andre Thomas,)

Plaintiff,)

-vs-

Civil Action No.
2:09-cv-00996-NBF

BOROUGH OF SWISSVALE; DEBRA)
LYNN INDOVINA-AKERLY; JUSTIN)
LEE KEENAN; and GARY DICKSON,)

Defendants.)

- - - -

DEPOSITION OF: CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., J.D.

- - - -

DATE: June 2, 2011
Thursday, 10:34 a.m.

LOCATION: 1119 Penn Avenue
Suite 404
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

TAKEN BY: Defendants
Job No. AMB182489
REPORTED BY: Sherry Dean
Notary Public
Reference No. SD22786

1 didn't limit it to their case; I talked more
2 broadly about the fact that forensic
3 pathologists working in coroner and medical
4 examiners' offices must remain independent,
5 must be objective, and must not be considered
6 in their own minds nor allow themselves to be
7 so considered as an arm of the prosecution in
8 criminal cases. So that was the essence of my
9 discussion.

10 Q. Now, how did that relate to the topic of
11 excited delirium?

12 A. The way it relates to excited delirium is
13 that -- and it gets back to my letter -- is
14 that I believe, to a very great extent, medical
15 examiners in the United States of America are
16 extremely reluctant to attribute a death to the
17 physical actions of police officers and reach
18 out for excited delirium, which has become a
19 favorite diagnosis of theirs. Although, it has
20 not been recognized by the American Medical
21 Association or the American Psychiatric
22 Association and has been soundly criticized and
23 pretty much condemned by Canadian law
24 enforcement and Canadian scientists and so on.

25 So that's how it fit it in; talking

1 about the need for independence and pointing
2 out that the purpose or one of the
3 responsibilities of a medical examiner is to be
4 scientifically objective. This is something
5 that I've talked about over the years; that
6 it's understandable that coroners, medical
7 examiners, you work with police officers;
8 they're your friends. They take care of your
9 wife's traffic ticket, your son's marijuana
10 charge, you have lunch with them, and so on,
11 and you never even see a defense attorney until
12 you come to court. Because the defense
13 attorneys, too often, are negligent themselves
14 in not insisting upon a meeting with the
15 forensic pathologist who did an autopsy in a
16 murder case, as they would in some other
17 matter.

18 So those are the kinds of things I've
19 talked about. So how does it relate? I think
20 that medical examiners, a combination of
21 that -- and it's a generalization --
22 relationship with law enforcement officers whom
23 they deal with and see all the time in larger
24 metropolitan areas literally everyday, coupled
25 with, when it comes to Tasers, the extreme

1 pressures and very aggressive approaches
2 undertaken by the TASER company.

3 Putting that together has resulted in
4 a reaching out for the diagnosis of excited
5 delirium or agitated delirium, ignoring Tasers,
6 ignoring physical altercations, ignoring
7 physical evidence of body weights of one or
8 more police officers on a victim resulting in
9 positional asphyxiation; totally ignoring them;
10 not even considering them as contributing
11 factors, if not the actual cause of death.

12 So I'm giving you a long answer
13 because I want to be candid with you and answer
14 your question and also explain how I feel about
15 these matters; but specifically, then, how it
16 relates to excited delirium.

17 Q. Let me ask you this, because here's what I'm
18 hearing and you correct me if I'm wrong. I'm
19 hearing from you that as far as Dr. Cyril Wecht
20 is concerned, whether you call it excited
21 delirium or agitated delirium, that term is not
22 a valid scientific or medical diagnosis.

23 A. Not completely. It's not an officially
24 recognized term by two groups in this country
25 that are much, much larger than forensic

1 pathologists and less personally involved with
2 law enforcement. Is there such a thing, from a
3 pathophysiological standpoint, as somebody
4 becoming excited, becoming agitated, from
5 cocaine, from schizophrenia, or some other
6 neurological disorder, or even sometimes from
7 other drugs? Yes, I recognize that. And can
8 that lead to aberrant, socially unacceptable
9 behavior? Can that play a role, then, in the
10 individual's cardiovascular and respiratory
11 status? And can it contribute to events in his
12 own body? And can it indirectly lead to
13 involvement by third parties, law enforcement
14 officers, and others? Well, I recognize all of
15 that. Of course, you don't have to be a doctor
16 to understand and appreciate that.

17 Do I believe that excited delirium
18 has been, in some way, scientifically proven?
19 No, I do not, because it is conjectural; there
20 is no way to prove it. I'm not being critical
21 of my colleagues; I'm just saying you cannot
22 look at tissues grossly or microscopically and
23 say here is a case of excited delirium, like
24 you can myocardial infarction, pulmonary
25 embolism, a cerebral vascular accident,

1 traumatic lacerations of the liver with
2 hemoperitoneum, et cetera, et cetera. That
3 kind of scientific corroboration has not yet
4 occurred.

5 Q. Can you do what you say you can't do in an
6 autopsy setting and come up with excited -- can
7 you do that as it relates to positional
8 asphyxia?

9 A. Yes, if you have evidence of either usually two
10 or more police officers subduing an
11 individual --

12 Q. Excuse me, if I can, Doctor. I'm trying to
13 suggest that -- so that you and I are on the
14 same page -- I thought you were saying with
15 regard to a scientific or medical diagnosis of
16 excited or agitated delirium that a pathologist
17 cannot go into an autopsy setting and based
18 strictly upon his findings in that room, based
19 upon that autopsy examination alone, he cannot
20 come out with a valid cause of death of excited
21 delirium.

22 MR. MESSER: I'm going to object to
23 the question. I don't believe that was the
24 testimony that Dr. Wecht offered.

25 BY MR. HAMILTON:

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. -- just so you'll know that what I've said is
3 accurate.

4 Q. And if you go back to page 11 of 14 on the
5 Shakir autopsy where he discusses
6 Musculoskeletal System, you'll see about the
7 third line down that the vertebral bodies are
8 not remarkable; no hemorrhages are noted in the
9 paravertebral muscles; the sternum, ribs, and
10 spine exhibit the usual bone density and
11 marrow. Correct?

12 A. That's what he says; yes, that's correct.

13 Q. Do you disagree with that?

14 A. Yes, if you'll look at my autopsy beginning at
15 the bottom of page ten -- I'll wait until you
16 get there.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. Now, there was one more sentence in
19 Dr. Shakir's report under Musculoskeletal
20 System which does reflect a 6 by 3 centimeter
21 area of subcutaneous hemorrhage at the middle
22 of the lower back. So that's two and
23 two-fifths of an inch by one and one-fifth of
24 an inch. So he does describe that hemorrhage.
25 I found some staining along the lower

1 thoracic and lumbar vertebrae, beginning at the
2 bottom of page ten, and when I removed those
3 with an electric saw I found evidence of some
4 hemorrhage in the periosteum. The periosteum
5 is a very tightly invested fibrous tissue.
6 Peri, around; osteum, bone. And it did not go
7 into the vertebrae themselves, but there was
8 some hemorrhage.

9 And then I saw that hemorrhage which
10 evidently is the one he's referring to. He
11 measured it 6 by 3, and I measured it as 5.5 by
12 2.7; pretty darn close, because I didn't have
13 his report at the time.

14 And then he had not removed the
15 spinal cord, which I did on page eleven, and
16 then there was a focal subdural hemorrhage,
17 which is overlying the spinal cord down at the
18 base where the cord ends and goes out into
19 strands called cauda equina; tail of a horse.
20 So there was some hemorrhage there and that
21 extended for about seven centimeters; a little
22 less than three inches.

23 So I did find evidence of hemorrhage
24 in the structures of the back, which, as you
25 said before correctly, are not observable

1 externally, but which are found internally.
2 And then when you cut into the spinal canal
3 with an electric saw, then additional
4 hemorrhages were noted which Dr. Shakir could
5 not have seen because the spinal cord was not
6 removed.

7 Q. And the pathological explanations for that
8 hemorrhaging that you saw in the area that you
9 saw it include what?

10 A. In my opinion, it would be pressure applied to
11 the back. I think that if they were from
12 punches, it would be hard, if not impossible,
13 to do that without getting some bruising on the
14 skin. So I think, therefore, it's more a
15 matter of pressure, which is disseminated.

16 You see, the smaller the area in
17 which an injury occur, obviously, the greater
18 concentration of force at that area. The
19 broader it becomes, the more spread out, the
20 more diffuse are the lines of force. So I
21 would say that these findings are consistent
22 with pressure rather than punches or blows.

23 Q. And you found these in the low back?

24 A. The lower thoracic into the lumbar region, yes.

25 Q. Belt level of an individual?

1 question about what you just said?

2 A. Sure, sure.

3 Q. Are you suggesting that this subperiosteal
4 hemorrhage of the sphenoid ridge is diagnostic
5 of asphyxiation or consistent with?

6 A. I'd say consistent with. By itself I would not
7 make a diagnosis, but it would be a finding
8 that is consistent with and supportive of an
9 asphyxial kind of situation.

10 Q. Now, you said page 14.

11 A. Yeah, if you look under Penis, the very last
12 paragraph of my report, this really addresses
13 the question you had asked about pressure.
14 This was an extensive, bright red, fresh
15 hemorrhage extending from the dorsal, which is
16 the top of the penis, ventral, the
17 undersurface, more than half the length from
18 the base; in other words, where the penile
19 shaft emerges from its attachment to the
20 abdominal area above and the scrotal sac
21 beneath.

22 In order to get that kind of
23 hemorrhage on both the top and the bottom, that
24 had to have required a substantial amount of
25 force being applied to this man as he lay in a

1 prone position. And just think how many
2 times -- going back to our football scenario,
3 going back to other situations of people piling
4 on and so on, when did you ever hear of
5 somebody's penis being injured? I'm not
6 telling you it can't happen, but it sure is a
7 darn rare thing.

8 Q. That's probably something the announcers don't
9 say on national TV.

10 A. I guess they wear cups, but anyway, in this
11 case this is a very significant finding which
12 can only be seen when the penis is cut into.
13 And that clearly comes from pressure. There's
14 no other way that that injury could have been
15 sustained, in my opinion, other than from
16 significant pressure being applied down in the
17 lower back; the penis obviously being trapped
18 by virtue of its anatomic location and the
19 pressure then going on through the lower
20 abdominal cavity out onto the penis.

21 Q. And, at least as far as my anatomical form is
22 concerned, if I'm laying prone, my suggestion
23 to you -- you tell me if I'm right or wrong --
24 that this finding that you're detailing now on
25 page 14 would suggest pressure in the buttocks

1 Q. Now, let's talk about the effect, if any, of
2 this man's level of cocaine in his body at the
3 time of this incident. You indicate in your
4 report acute cocaine toxicity. That's in your
5 autopsy, I'm sorry.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What does that mean?

8 A. It means that there's evidence that he had used
9 cocaine within a matter of a few hours prior to
10 his death.

11 Q. Now, do you have an opinion as to whether the
12 ingestion of that cocaine a few hours prior to
13 his death had anything to do with his death?

14 A. I can't be sure. The level is quite low. The
15 level is just actually about one-tenth of the
16 average level reported in the top textbook of
17 forensic toxicology, Baselt, B-A-S-E-L-T, as
18 the average amount reported in their
19 fatalities. And it's just a little bit more
20 than half of the lowest report that they
21 include -- a very, very, wide range, but it's
22 just about one-tenth of the average found in
23 the blood. So it's a quite low level.

24 I also understand that this man had
25 used cocaine before, and as we all know,